

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/642,602

Applicant(s)

FUTAMI ET AL.

Examiner

Nathan Curs

Art Unit

2613

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nathan Curs.

(3) Paul Kravetz.

(2) Jennifer Baer.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 December 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Admitted Prior Art and Kajiya.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Baer presented a draft response to the Final Office Action of 4 September 2007, including an argument that the combination did not read on the "wherein" clause of e.g. claim 1. Mr. Curs explained the reasoning behind the combination, pointing out how the Admitted Prior Art was modified based on the cited portion of Kajiya to read on the limitations, including how a doubled modulation factor for the driving signal in the combination produced a modulator output having twice the frequency of the driving signal, and that the resulting voltage magnitude of the driving signal corresponded to the voltage difference in 1 period of the transmission characteristic of the modulator.